arXiv:1510.05437v1 [quant-ph] 19 Oct 2015

Activated zero-error classical capacity of quantum channels in the presence of quantum no-signalling correlations

Runyao Duan[1,2*] and Xin Wang[1†]
[1]*Centre for Quantum Computation and Intelligent Systems (QCIS), Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology, University of Technology, Sydney (UTS), NSW 2007, Australia and*
[2]*UTS-AMSS Joint Research Laboratory for Quantum Computation and Quantum Information Processing, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*

Recently the one-shot quantum no-signalling assisted zero-error classical capacity of a quantum channel has been formulated as a semidefinite programming (SDP) depending only on the Choi-Kraus operator space of the channel. In this paper, we study the *activated quantum no-signalling assisted zero-error classical capacity* by first allowing the assistance from some noiseless forward communication channel and later paying back the cost of the helper. We show that the one-shot activated capacity can also be formulated as a SDP and derive a number of striking properties of this number. In particular, this number is additive under direct sum, and is always greater than or equal to the super-dense coding bound. An a remarkable consequence, we find that one bit noiseless classical communication is able to fully activate any cq-channel to achieve its asymptotic capacity, or the semidefinite fractional packing number. We also discuss the condition under which a noisy channel can activate an activatable channel. Interestingly, a channel is able to activate itself if its one-shot capacity is greater than or equal to the Golden Ratio—$(1+\sqrt{5})/2$. We also show that the asymptotic activated capacity is still equal to the usual no-signalling assisted capacity. Finally, we show that general the asymptotic no-signalling assisted zero-error capacity does not equal to the semidefinite (fractional) packing number by an explicit construction.

PACS numbers:

A fundamental problem of information theory is to determine the capacity of a communication channel, which describes the capability of the channel for delivering information from the sender to the receiver. Shannon first discussed this problem in the zero-error setting and described the zero-error capacity of a channel as the maximum rate at which it can be used to transmit information perfectly [1]. It is well-known that the Shannon zero-error capacity is extremely difficult to compute even for very simple classical channels. Nevertheless, this capacity is upper bounded by the celebrated Lovász ϑ function which is efficiently computable by semidefinite programming [2].

Recently the zero-error information theory has been studied in the quantum setting and many interesting phenomena were observed. For instance, it was shown that shared entanglement can sometimes improve the zero-error classical capacity of a classical channel [3, 4]. Furthermore, both the zero-error classical and quantum capacities can be super-activated [5–8]. Another notable fact is that the entanglement-assisted zero-error classical capacity of a classical channel is also upper-bounded by the Lovász ϑ function [9, 10], and this result can be generalized to quantum setting by using a quantum version of Lovász ϑ function [10].

The no-signalling correlations arises in the research of the relativistic causality of quantum operations [11–14]. Cubitt et al. [15] first introduced classical no-signalling correlations into the zero-error classical communication and proved that the fractional packing number of the bipartite graph induced by the channel equals to the zero-error classical capacity of the channel. one of us and Winter [17] further introduced quantum non-signalling correlations into the zero-error communication problem and formulated the one-shot capacity as a semidefinite programming (SDP) [16] (see Eq. (1)), which indicates that the zero-error classical capability of a quantum channel

$\mathcal{N}$ assisted by quantum no-signalling correlations depends only on an operator space K which is given by the linear span of the Choi-Kraus operators of the channel $\mathcal{N}$. Furthermore, Duan, Severini, and Winter studied the zero-error communication via quantum channel assisted by unlimited noiseless feedback and showed the induced capacity also depends only on K [18]. These effort motivated the introduction of the so-called "non-commutative graph theory" in [10], and substantial development were made in [17, 18]. Intuitively, the non-commutative graph associated with a quantum channel captures the zero-error communication properties of the channel, while the Choi-Kraus operator space K plays a similar role to the bipartite graph. Such Choi-Kraus operator space K is alternatively called "non-commutative bipartite graph". As showed in [17], the one-shot zero-error classical capacity of K in the presence of quantum non-signalling correlations is given by the following SDP:

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon(K) = \max \operatorname{Tr} S_A \ \text{ s.t. } \ & 0 \leq U_{AB} \leq S_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B, \\ & \operatorname{Tr}_A U_{AB} = \mathbb{1}_B, \\ & \operatorname{Tr} P_{AB}(S_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B - U_{AB}) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here, P_{AB} denotes the projection onto the support of the Choi-Jamiołkowski matrix of $\mathcal{N}$, which is uniquely determined by the space K. Then by the regularization, the no-signalling assisted zero-error capacity is

$$C_{0,\mathrm{NS}}(K) = \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} \log \Upsilon\left(K^{\otimes n}\right).$$

For the classical-quantum (cq) channel, the non-commutative bipartite graph is called cq-graph. The one-shot no-signalling assisted zero-error capacity is the solution to the following SDP:

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_{cq}(K) = \max \sum_i s_i \ \text{ s.t. } \ & 0 \leq s_i,\ 0 \leq R_i \leq s_i(\mathbb{1} - P_i), \\ & \sum_i (s_i P_i + R_i) = \mathbb{1}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Moreover, the asymptotic no-signalling assisted zero-error classical capacity of a cq-channel is equal to the semidefinite (fractional) packing number first suggested by Harrow [17]:

$$\mathsf{A}(K) = \max \operatorname{Tr} S_A \text{ s.t. } 0 \leq S_A, \operatorname{Tr}_A P_{AB}(S_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B) \leq \mathbb{1}_B. \tag{3}$$

In this paper, we further develop the theory of quantum no-signalling assisted communication by introducing additional forward noiseless communication channels. The model is remarkably simple, and can be described as follows. For a quantum channel $\mathcal{N}$ assisted by quantum no-signalling correlations, we can "borrow" a noiseless classical channel Δ_ℓ whose zero-error classical capacity is ℓ, then we can use $\mathcal{N} \otimes \Delta_\ell$ to transmit information. After the communication finishes we "pay back" the capacity of Δ_ℓ. This kind of communication method was suggested in [22], and was highly relevant to the notion of *potential capacity* recently studied by Winter and Yang [23]. Based on this model, such capacity is called the activated zero-error capacity and the one-shot case can also be formulated as a SDP. We will show that one bit is sufficient to activate an activatable quantum channel, which means that noiseless channel with more capacity cannot improve the efficiency of the activation for a given channel. It is quite striking that one bit can even fully activate any cq-channel to achieve its asymptotic no-signalling assisted zero-error capacity. Furthermore, we study the activation between two noisy quantum channels as well as the capacity of the direct sum of two non-commutative bipartite graphs and present a connection to Lovász ϑ number. In the end, we will exhibit a quantum channel whose activated capacity is strictly larger than $\mathsf{A}(K)$.

Definition 1 *For a quantum channel $\mathcal{N} : \mathcal{L}(A) \to \mathcal{L}(B)$ with non-commutative bipartite graph K, the one-shot activated no-signalling assisted zero-error classical capacity is defined as the following:*

$$\Upsilon^a(\mathcal{N}) = \Upsilon^a(K) := \sup_{\ell \geq 1} \frac{\Upsilon(K \otimes \Delta_\ell)}{\ell}.$$

The asymptotic activated no-signalling zero-error classical capacity is given the regularization:

$$C^a_{0,NS}(\mathcal{N}) = C^a_{0,NS}(K) := \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} \log \Upsilon^a \left(K^{\otimes n}\right).$$

Since the capacity only depends on the non-commutative bipartite graph K, we will omit the underling quantum channel $\mathcal{N}$ in the following discussion. We call a non-commutative bipartite graph K activatable if $\Upsilon^a(K) > \Upsilon(K)$.

To provide a feasible formulation of the activated capacity, let us introduce a slightly revised SDP of $\Upsilon(K)$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Upsilon}(K) = \max \operatorname{Tr} S_A \ \text{ s.t. } \ & 0 \leq U_{AB} \leq S_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B, \\ & \operatorname{Tr}_A U_{AB} \leq \mathbb{1}_B, \\ & \operatorname{Tr} P_{AB}(S_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B - U_{AB}) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The only difference between $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$ and $\Upsilon(K)$ is that now $\operatorname{Tr}_A U_{AB}$ is only required to be less than or equal to $\mathbb{1}_B$, and a strict equality is not necessary. However, we will see that such a small revision is of crucial importance. The dual SDP of $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Upsilon}(K) = \min \operatorname{Tr} T_B \ \text{ s.t. } \ & V_{AB} \leq \mathbb{1}_A \otimes T_B, \\ & \operatorname{Tr}_B V_{AB} \geq \mathbb{1}_A, \ T \geq 0, \\ & (\mathbb{1} - P)_{AB} V_{AB} (\mathbb{1} - P)_{AB} \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Note that by strong duality, the values of both the primal and the dual SDP coincide. It is also easy to check that $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$ is super-multiplicative, i.e., $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1 \otimes K_2) \geq \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1)\widehat{\Upsilon}(K_2)$ for any K_1 and K_2. A simple but useful property of $\widehat{\Upsilon}$ is the following:

Lemma 2 *For any non-commutative bipartite graph K, we have*

$$\widehat{\Upsilon}(K \otimes \Delta_\ell) = \ell\, \widehat{\Upsilon}(K).$$

Proof On one hand, it is evident from the super-multiplicativity that $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K \otimes \Delta_\ell) \geq \ell\, \widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$. On the other hand, note that an optimal solution for SDP (5) for Δ_ℓ is given by $\{\mathbb{1}_{B'}, \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |ii\rangle\langle ii|_{A'B'}\}$, and we assume that the optimal solution of SDP (5) for K is $\{T_B, V_{AB}\}$. It is evident that $V_{AB} \otimes \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |ii\rangle\langle ii|_{A'B'} \leq \mathbb{1}_{AA'} \otimes T_B \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B'}$. Then, it is easy to see that $\{V_{AB} \otimes \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} |ii\rangle\langle ii|_{A'B'}, T_B \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B'}\}$ is a feasible solution of SDP(5) for $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K \otimes \Delta_\ell)$. Therefore,$\widehat{\Upsilon}(K \otimes \Delta_\ell) \leq \operatorname{Tr} T_B \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B'} = \ell\, \widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$. □

Now we are ready to present the main result.

Theorem 3 *For any non-commutative bipartite graph K, $\Upsilon^a(K) = \widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$.*

In other words, $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$ is the one-shot activated no-signalling assisted zero-error classical capacity of K. Due to this fact, we will not distinguish between the notations $\Upsilon^a(K)$ and $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$ in the rest of this paper.

Proof It suffices to show that

$$\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) = \sup_{\ell\geq 2} \frac{\Upsilon(K\otimes\Delta_\ell)}{\ell} = \frac{\Upsilon(K\otimes\Delta_2)}{2}.$$

On one hand, from Lemma 2,

$$\ell\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) = \widehat{\Upsilon}(K\otimes\Delta_\ell) \geq \Upsilon(K\otimes\Delta_\ell), \tag{6}$$

which means that $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) \geq \sup_{\ell\geq 2} \frac{\Upsilon(K\otimes\Delta_\ell)}{\ell}$.

On the other hand, let us first consider the case $\ell = 2$ and assume that the optimal feasible solution of $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$ is $\{S_A, U_{AB}\}$. Let $S_{AA'} = S_A \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|)_{A'}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} U_{AA'BB'} =& U_{AB} \otimes (|00\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|)_{A'B'} \\ &+ \bar{U}_{AB} \otimes (|01\rangle\langle 01| + |10\rangle\langle 10|)_{A'B'}, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where $\bar{U}_{AB} = \frac{S_A}{\mathrm{Tr}\, S_A} \otimes (\mathbb{1}_B - \mathrm{Tr}_A\, U_{AB})$. Then, $\mathrm{Tr}_{AA'}\, U_{AA'BB'} = \mathrm{Tr}_A((U_{AB} + \bar{U}_{AB}) \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B'}) = \mathbb{1}_{BB'}$.

Notice that $S_{AA'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{BB'} - U_{AA'BB'} = (S_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B - U_{AB}) \otimes (|00\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|)_{A'B'} + (S_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B - \bar{U}_{AB}) \otimes (|01\rangle\langle 01| + |10\rangle\langle 10|)_{A'B'}$, it is easy to check that $S_{AA'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{BB'} - U_{AA'BB'} \geq 0$. Also, noting that $\mathrm{Tr}\, P_{AB}(S_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B - U_{AB}) = 0$ and $\mathrm{Tr}\, \mathbb{1}_{A'B'}(|01\rangle\langle 01| + |10\rangle\langle 10|)_{A'B'} = 0$, we have that $\mathrm{Tr}(P_{AB} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A'B'})(S_{AA'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{BB'} - U_{AA'BB'}) = 0$.

Therefore, $\{S_{AA'}, U_{AA'BB'}\}$ is a feasible solution of $\Upsilon(K\otimes\Delta_2)$, which means that $\sup_{\ell\geq 2} \frac{\Upsilon(K\otimes\Delta_\ell)}{\ell} \geq \frac{\Upsilon(K\otimes\Delta_2)}{2} \geq \frac{\mathrm{Tr}\, S_{AA'}}{2} = \widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$. □

Indeed, in the previous proof we have shown the following stronger result:

$$\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) = \frac{\Upsilon(K\otimes\Delta_\ell)}{\ell} = \frac{\Upsilon(K\otimes\Delta_2)}{2}, \forall\, \ell \geq 2.$$

For any cq-graph K, SDP (4) and SDP (3) can be simplied to

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Upsilon}(K) = \max \sum_i s_i \ \text{ s.t. } \ & 0 \leq s_i,\ 0 \leq R_i \leq s_i(\mathbb{1} - P_i), \\ & \sum_i (s_i P_i + R_i) \leq \mathbb{1}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

and

$$\mathsf{A}(K) = \max \sum_i s_i \ \text{ s.t. } \ 0 \leq s_i,\ \sum_i s_i P_i \leq \mathbb{1}, \tag{9}$$

respectively.

Theorem 4 *For any cq-graph K, $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) = \mathsf{A}(K)$. In other words, the one-shot activated zero-error no-signalling assisted zero-error classical capacity is by its asymptotic no-signalling assisted zero-error capacity.*

Proof It is evident that $\mathsf{A}(K) \geq \widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$. Then assume the optimal solution of SDP(9) is $\{s_i\}$, let $R_i = 0$ for all i. It is easy to check that $\{s_i, R_i\}$ is a feasible solution of SDP(8), which means that $\mathsf{A}(K) \leq \widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$. Therefore, $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) = \mathsf{A}(K)$. □

Example For the simplest possible cq-channel $\mathcal{N}$, which has only two inputs and two pure output states $P_i = |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$. W.l.o.g., we assume that $|\psi_0\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ and $|\psi_1\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle - \beta|1\rangle$ with $\alpha \geq \beta = \sqrt{1-\alpha^2}$. In [17], it has been solved that $\Upsilon(K) = 1$ and $\mathsf{A}(K) = \frac{1}{\alpha^2}$. Hence, by Theorem 4, $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) = \frac{\Upsilon(\mathcal{N}\otimes\Delta_2)}{2} = \frac{1}{\alpha^2} > \Upsilon(K) = 1$. □

Theorem 5 *For any two non-commutative bipartite graph K_1 and K_2, if $\Upsilon(K_2) - 1 \geq \frac{1}{\widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1)}$, then*

$$\frac{\Upsilon(K_1 \otimes K_2)}{\Upsilon(K_2)} \geq \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1). \tag{10}$$

In other words, K_2 can activate K_1 if K_1 is activatable. In particular, this inequality always holds when $\Upsilon(K_2) \geq 2$.

Proof Assume the optimal solution of $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1)$ and $\Upsilon(K_2)$ are $\{S_A, U_{AB}\}$ and $\{S_{A'}, U_{A'B'}\}$ respectively. Let $S_{AA'} = S_A \otimes S_{A'}$ and $U_{AA'BB'} = U_{AB} \otimes U_{A'B'} + \bar{U}_{AB} \otimes V_{A'B'}$, where $V_{A'B'} = (S_{A'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{B'} - U_{A'B'})/(\operatorname{Tr} S_{A'} - 1)$ and $\bar{U}_{AB} = S_A/\operatorname{Tr} S_A \otimes (\mathbb{1}_B - \operatorname{Tr}_A U_{AB})$.

Noting that $S_{AA'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{BB'} - U_{AA'BB'} = (S_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B - U_{AB}) \otimes U_{A'B'} + [(\operatorname{Tr} S_{A'} - 1 - \frac{1}{\operatorname{Tr} S_A}) S_A \otimes \mathbb{1}_B] \otimes V_{A'B'}$, it is easy to check that $S_{AA'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{BB'} - U_{AA'BB'} \geq 0$, $\operatorname{Tr}_{AA'} U_{AA'BB'} = \mathbb{1}_{BB'}$ and $(P_{AB} \otimes P_{A'B'})(S_{AA'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{BB'} - U_{AA'BB'}) = 0$. Therefore, $\{S_{AA'}, U_{AA'BB'}\}$ is a feasible solution of $\Upsilon(K_1 \otimes K_2)$, which means that $\Upsilon(K_1 \otimes K_2) \geq \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1)\Upsilon(K_2)$. □

Corollary 6 *For any $\mathcal{N}_1 : \mathcal{L}(A) \to \mathcal{L}(B)$ with non-commutative bipartite graph K, if $\Upsilon(K) \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$, then*

$$\frac{\Upsilon(K \otimes K)}{\Upsilon(K)} \geq \widehat{\Upsilon}(K). \tag{11}$$

Proof Note that $\Upsilon(K) \geq \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ means $\Upsilon(K) - 1 - \frac{1}{\Upsilon(K)} \geq 0$. Thus the result follows directly from Theorem 5. □

Theorem 7 *For any non-commutative bipartite graph K with positive zero-error capacity ($C_{0,NS}(K) > 0$ or $\mathsf{A}(K) > 1$), let n_0 be the smallest integer such that $\Upsilon(K^{\otimes n_0}) \geq 2$. Note that n_0 always exists and depends only on K. Then for any $n \geq n_0$, we have*

$$2\widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes(n-n_0)}) \leq \Upsilon(K^{\otimes n}) \leq \widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes n}). \tag{12}$$

Moreover,

$$C^a_{0,NS}(K) = \sup_{n\geq 1} \log \sqrt[n]{\widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes n})} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \log \sqrt[n]{\widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes n})} = C_{0,NS}(K). \tag{13}$$

Proof Eq. (12) is immediatelly from Theorem 5. Then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \log \sqrt[n]{\widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes n})} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \log \sqrt[n]{\Upsilon(K^{\otimes n})}$. To prove Eq. (13), the technique is based on a lemma about existence of limits in [19]. On one hand, $\log \widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes n}) \leq 2n \log d$. On the other hand, since $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$ is super-multiplicative, then $\log \widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes(mn)}) \geq \log \widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes m}) + \log \widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes n})$. Therefore, $\sup_{n\geq 1} \frac{\log \widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes n})}{n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \widehat{\Upsilon}(K^{\otimes n})}{n} = C_{0,NS}(K)$. □

Corollary 8 *For any cq graph K, we have that*

$$2\mathsf{A}(K)^{(n-n_0)} \leq \Upsilon(K^{\otimes n}) \leq \mathsf{A}(K)^n, \tag{14}$$

where n_0 is the minimum positive integer such that $\Upsilon(K^{n_0}) \geq 2$. In particular, n_0=1 if $\Upsilon(K) \geq 2$. (That is, by using channel n times we will loss at most 1 bit comparing to the optimal value).

Theorem 9 *For any two non-commutative bipartite graph K_1 and K_2,*

$$\Upsilon(K_1 \oplus K_2) = \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1) + \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_2). \tag{15}$$

Proof Suppose that the support projections of K_1, K_2 are P_{AB} and Q_{AB}, then the support projection of $K_1 \oplus K_2$ is $P_{AB} \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00|_{A'B'} + Q_{AB} \otimes |11\rangle\langle 11|_{A'B'}$.

On one hand, assume that the optimal solution of $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1)$ and $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K_2)$ are $\{S_A^{(1)}, U_{AB}^{(1)}\}$ and $\{S_A^{(2)}, U_{AB}^{(2)}\}$ respectively. Let $S_{AA'} = S_A^{(1)} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|_{A'} + S_A^{(2)} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_{A'}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} U_{AA'BB'} =& U_{AB}^{(1)} \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00|_{A'B'} + \bar{U}_{AB}^{(1)} \otimes |10\rangle\langle 10|_{A'B'} \\ &+ U_{AB}^{(2)} \otimes |11\rangle\langle 11|_{A'B'} + \bar{U}_{AB}^{(2)} \otimes |01\rangle\langle 01|_{A'B'}, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where $\bar{U}_{AB}^{(1)} = \frac{S_A^{(2)}}{\mathrm{Tr}\, S_A^{(2)}} \otimes (\mathbb{1}_B - \mathrm{Tr}_A\, U_{AB}^{(1)})$ and $\bar{U}_{AB}^{(2)} = \frac{S_A^{(1)}}{\mathrm{Tr}\, S_A^{(1)}} \otimes (\mathbb{1}_B - \mathrm{Tr}_A\, U_{AB}^{(2)})$ Then, $\mathrm{Tr}_{AA'}\, U_{AA'BB'} = \mathbb{1}_B \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|)_{B'} = \mathbb{1}_{BB'}$.

Noting that $S_{AA'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{BB'} - U_{AA'BB'} = (S_A^{(1)} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B - U_{AB}^{(1)}) \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00| + (S_A^{(2)} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B - U_{AB}^{(2)}) \otimes |11\rangle\langle 11|_{A'B'} + (S_A^{(1)} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B - \bar{U}_{AB}^{(2)}) \otimes |01\rangle\langle 01| + (S_A^{(2)} \otimes \mathbb{1}_B - \bar{U}_{AB}^{(1)})|10\rangle\langle 10|)_{A'B'}$, it is easy to check that $S_{AA'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{BB'} - U_{AA'BB'} \geq 0$ and $(P_{AB} \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00|_{A'B'} + Q_{AB} \otimes |11\rangle\langle 11|_{A'B'})(S_{AA'} \otimes \mathbb{1}_{BB'} - U_{AA'BB'}) = 0$.

Therefore, $\{S_{AA'}, U_{AA'BB'}\}$ is a feasible solution of $\Upsilon(K_1 \oplus K_2)$, which means that $\Upsilon(K_1 \oplus K_2) \geq \mathrm{Tr}\, S_{AA'} = \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1) + \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_2)$.

On the other hand, noting that the support projector of $\Upsilon(K_1 \oplus K_2)$ is $P_{AB} \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00|_{A'B'} + Q_{AB} \otimes |11\rangle\langle 11|_{A'B'}$, it is easy to see that the optimal solution of $\Upsilon(K_1 \oplus K_2)$ is in the form $S_{AA'} = S_A^{(1)} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + S_A^{(2)} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|_{A'}$, $U_{AA'BB'} = \sum_{k,j=0,1} U_{AB}^{(kj)} \otimes |kj\rangle\langle kj|$. Then the constraints of $\Upsilon(K_1 \oplus K_2)$ can be converted to

$$\begin{aligned} &(S_A^{(1)} - U_{AB}^{(00)}) \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00| + (S_A^{(1)} - U_{AB}^{(01)}) \otimes |01\rangle\langle 01| \geq 0, \\ &(S_A^{(2)} - U_{AB}^{(10)}) \otimes |10\rangle\langle 10| + (S_A^{(2)} - U_{AB}^{(11)}) \otimes |11\rangle\langle 11| \geq 0, \\ &P_{AB}(S_A^{(1)} - U_{AB}^{(00)}) = 0, Q_{AB}(S_A^{(2)} - U_{AB}^{(11)}) = 0, \\ &\mathrm{Tr}_A(U_{AB}^{(00)} + U_{AB}^{(01)}) = \mathbb{1}_B, \mathrm{Tr}_A(U_{AB}^{(10)} + U_{AB}^{(11)}) = \mathbb{1}_B. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Noting that these constraints can be separated into two SDPs which are equivalent to $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1)$ and $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K_2)$, then we have that $\Upsilon(K_1 \oplus K_2) \geq \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1) + \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_2)$. Hence, $\Upsilon(K_1 \oplus K_2) = \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1) + \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_2)$. □

Corollary 10 *For any non-commutative bipartite graph K,* $\Upsilon(K \otimes \Delta_\ell) = \ell \widehat{\Upsilon}(K)$.

Proof Noting that $K \otimes \Delta_\ell = K \oplus K \oplus ... \oplus K$, it is evident from Theorem 9. □

Let G be a confusability graph of some channel, as showed in [17],

$$\Upsilon(G) = \min\{\Upsilon(K) : K \text{ cq-graph with } K^\dagger K \subseteq G\}$$

and

$$\vartheta(G) = \min\{\mathsf{A}(K) : K \text{ cq-graph with } K^\dagger K \subseteq G\}.$$

Corollary 11 *For two confusability graphs G_1 and G_2,*

$$\Upsilon(G_1 \oplus G_2) = \vartheta(G_1) + \vartheta(G_2). \tag{18}$$

Proof There exists ${K_1}^\dagger K_1 \subseteq G_1$ and ${K_2}^\dagger K_2 \subseteq G_2$ such that $\mathsf{A}(K_1) = \vartheta(G_1)$ and $\mathsf{A}(K_2) = \vartheta(G_2)$, then $\Upsilon(G_1 \oplus G_2) = \Upsilon(K_1 \oplus K_2) = \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1) + \widehat{\Upsilon}(K_2) = \vartheta(G_1) + \vartheta(G_2)$. □

Also, Theorem 25 in [17] can be extended as follows.

Theorem 12 *Let K be a non-commutative bipartite graph with Choi-Jamiołkowski projection P_{AB}, and let $Q_{AB} = \mathbb{1}_{AB} - P_{AB}$ be the orthogonal complement of P_{AB}. Let $P_B = \mathrm{Tr}_A P_{AB}$, then the following are equivalent:*

i. $C_{0,\mathrm{NS}}(K) > 0$;

ii. $\mathsf{A}(K) > 1$;

iii. $P_B < d_A \mathbb{1}_B$;

iv. $\mathrm{Tr}_A Q_{AB}$ *is positive definite;*

v. $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) > 1$.

As a matter of fact, we have

$$C_{0,\mathrm{NS}}(K) \geq \widehat{\Upsilon}(K) \geq \log \frac{d_A}{\|P_B\|_\infty}, \mathsf{A}(K) \geq \frac{d_A}{\|P_B\|_\infty}. \tag{19}$$

Proof In [17], i) , ii), iii) and iv) are proved to be equivalent. We focus on v) here.

On one hand, it is easy from v) to i) by Theorem 7.

On the other hand, to prove i) to v), it is equivalent to prove iii) to v) and we can still use method in Theorem 1, which means that we can apply the standard super-dense coding protocol to obtain a cq-channel $\mathcal{N}_s$ with d_A^2 outputs $\{(U_m \otimes \mathbb{1}_B) J_{AB} (U_m \otimes \mathbb{1}_B)^\dagger\}$, and the projections are given by $\{(U_m \otimes \mathbb{1}_B) P_{AB} (U_m \otimes \mathbb{1}_B)^\dagger\}$, where U_m are generalized Pauli matrices acting on A. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{A}(\mathcal{N}_s) =& \frac{d_A^2}{\sum_{m=1}^{d_A^2} (U_m \otimes \mathbb{1}_B) P_{AB} (U_m \otimes \mathbb{1}_B)^\dagger} \\ =& \frac{d_A}{\|\mathrm{Tr}_A P_{AB}\|_\infty}. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Hence, $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) \geq \widehat{\Upsilon}(\mathcal{N}_s) = \mathsf{A}(\mathcal{N}_s)$. And when $\mathrm{Tr}_A P_{AB} < d_A \mathbb{1}_B$ strictly holds, the right-hand side of the above equation is strictly larger than 1. This also means that 1 bit is enough to activate any one-shot useless non-trival channel. □

Example The amplitude damping channel is $\mathcal{N} = \sum_{i=0}^{1} E_i \cdot E_i^\dagger$, with $E_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{1-r}|1\rangle\langle 1|$, $E_1 = \sqrt{r}|0\rangle\langle 1|$ and $0 \leq r \leq 1$. It is able to communicate zero-error information when assisted with no-signalling correlations. By applying the super-dense coding bound[17], $C_{0,\mathrm{NS}}(K_r) \geq \log \frac{4-2r}{3-r}$. In particular, when $r = 3/4$, let $S_A = \frac{3}{8}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{3}{4}|1\rangle\langle 1|$ and $U_{AB} = \frac{1}{4}(|00\rangle\langle 00| + |00\rangle\langle 11| + |11\rangle\langle 00| + |11\rangle\langle 11|) + \frac{3}{4}|10\rangle\langle 10|$, it is not difficult to check that $\{S_A, U_{AB}\}$ is an feasible solution of SDP(4). Hence, $\widehat{\Upsilon}(\mathcal{N}) \geq \mathrm{Tr}\, S_A/2 = 9/8 > 10/9 = \frac{4-2r}{3-r} > \Upsilon(K) = 1$. □

However, it is still hard to calculate the asypmtotic no-signalling zero-error capacity. As the asypmtotic capacity of cq channel is $\mathsf{A}(K)$, will it hold even for general case? We will exhibit an example to disprove it.

Proposition 13 *There exists a non-commutative bipartite graph K such that $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) > \mathsf{A}(K)$. Consequently, $C_{0,NS}(K) \neq \mathsf{A}(K)$.*

Proof Let K correspond to the quantum channel $\mathcal{N}(\rho) = \sum_{i=0}^{2} E_i \rho E_i^\dagger$ with $E_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|2\rangle\langle 0|$, $E_1 = \sqrt{\frac{50}{99}}|0\rangle\langle 2| + \sqrt{\frac{1}{99}}|1\rangle\langle 1| + \sqrt{\frac{49}{99}}|2\rangle\langle 2|$ and $E_2 = \sqrt{\frac{98}{99}}|0\rangle\langle 1|$. The support projection is

given by $P_{AB} = \sum_{i=0}^{2} |v_i\rangle\langle v_i|$ with $|v_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |02\rangle)$, $|v_1\rangle = |10\rangle$ and $|v_2\rangle = \frac{1}{10}|11\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|20\rangle + \frac{7}{10}|22\rangle$. Let $T_B = 1|0\rangle\langle 0| + \sqrt{0.1751}(|0\rangle\langle 2| + |2\rangle\langle 0|) + 0.1751|2\rangle\langle 2|$. We can easily check that $T_B \geq 0$ and $\mathrm{Tr}_B\, P_{AB}(\mathbb{1}_A \otimes T_B) \geq \mathbb{1}_A$, which means that $\mathsf{A}(K) \leq \mathrm{Tr}(T_B) = 1.1751$. Then, by semidefinite programming on Matlab [20, 21], $\widehat{\Upsilon}(K) \approx 1.1767 > 1.1751 \geq \mathsf{A}(K)$. That means $C_{0,NS}(K) > \mathsf{A}(K)$. □

In sum, we have shown that the one-shot activated capacity of a quantum channel is at least the super-dense coding bound and one bit noiseless classical communication is sufficient to activate the capacity of any cq-channel to achieve its asymptotic capacity. Furthermore, we have discussed the condition under which a quantum channel is able to activate an activatable quantum channel. In particular, when the one-shot no-signalling assisted capacity of an activatable channel is greater than or equal to the Golden Ratio—$(1+\sqrt{5})/2$, any such channel can always activate itself. Finally, the asymptotic capacity is still difficult to calculate since it can be larger than the semidefinite (fractional) packing number.

There are many related interesting open problems, of which we highlight a few here. For example, for any non-commutative bipartite graph K_1 and cq-graph K_{cq}, can we show

$$\widehat{\Upsilon}(K_1 \otimes K_{cq}) = \widehat{\Upsilon}(K)\widehat{\Upsilon}(K_{cq}) = \widehat{\Upsilon}(K)\mathsf{A}(K_{cq})?$$

Also, is there a positive integer n_0 such that the n_0-shot average capacity could achieve the asymptotic capacity?

This work was partly supported by the Australian Research Council (Grants No. DP120103776 and No. FT120100449) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 61179030).

* Electronic address: runyao.duan@uts.edu.au
† Electronic address: xin.wang-8@student.uts.edu.au

[1] C. E. Shannon, IRE Trans. Inf. Theory **2**, 3 (1956).
[2] L. Lovász, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **25**, 1 (1979).
[3] T. S. Cubitt, D. Leung, W. Matthews, A. Winter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 230503 (2010).
[4] D. Leung, L. Mančinska, W. Matthews, M. Ozols, A. Roy, Commun. Math. Phys. **311** (2012).
[5] R. Duan, arXiv:0906.2526
[6] R. Duan, Y. Shi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 020501 (2008).
[7] T. S. Cubitt, J. Chen, A. W. Harrow, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **57**, 12 (2011).
[8] T. S. Cubitt, G. Smith, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **58**, 3 (2012).
[9] S. Beigi, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 010303 (2010).
[10] R. Duan, S. Severini, A. Winter, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **59**, 2 (2013).
[11] D. Beckman, D. Gottesman, M. A. Nielsen, J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 052309 (2001).
[12] T. Eggeling, D. Schlingemann, R. F. Werner, Europhys. Lett. **57**, 6 (2002).
[13] M. Piani, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 012305 (2006).
[14] O. Oreshkov, F. Costa, Č. Brukner, Nature Comm. **3**, 10 (2012).
[15] T. S. Cubitt, D. Leung, W. Matthews, A. Winter, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **57**, 8 (2011).
[16] L. Vandenberghe, S. Boyd, SIAM Rev. **38**, 1 (1996).
[17] R. Duan, A. Winter, arXiv:1409.3426
[18] R. Duan, S. Severini, A. Winter, arXiv:1502.02987
[19] H. Barnum, M. A. Nielsen, and B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 4153 (1998).
[20] M. Grant and S. Boyd. CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.1. `http://cvxr.com/cvx` (2014).
[21] Nathaniel Johnston, Alessandro Cosentino, and Vincent Russo, QETLAB: A MATLAB toolbox for quantum entanglement, `http://qetlab.com` (2015).

[22] A. Acín, R. Duan, A. B. Sainz, and A. Winter, arXiv:1505.01265
[23] A. Winter and D. Yang, arXiv:1505.00907